



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/727,433	12/04/2003	Anatoly S. Belkin	CE10865R/10-167	6826
22917 7590 04/12/2007 MOTOROLA, INC. 1303 EAST ALGONQUIN ROAD IL01/3RD SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196			EXAMINER RAMPURIA, SHARAD K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/12/2007	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 04/12/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Docketing.Schaumburg@motorola.com  
APT099@motorola.com

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/727,433

Applicant(s)

BELKIN ET AL.

Examiner

Sharad Rampuria

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,11 and 12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,11 and 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

I. The Art Unit location of this application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 2617.

II. The current office-action is in response to the remarks filed on 01/18/2007.

Accordingly, Claims 3-10 and 13-27 are cancelled and Claims 1-2 and 11-12 are pending for further examination as follows:

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

III. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-2, 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Jagadeesan et al.** [US 7003298] in view of **Coombes et al.** [US 6138030] *hereinafter* **Jagadeesan** and **Coombes** respectively.

As per claim 1, Jagadeesan teaches:

A wireless communication unit (100; Fig.1) arranged and constructed for operation within a loosely coupled communication network comprising a first communication network and a second communication network, the wireless communication unit (Abstract, Col.1; 60-Col.2; 2) comprising:

A transceiver configured to support an air interface with the first communication network and with the second communication network; (Col.2; 55-58) and

Jagadeesan fails to teach, a controller arranged to control and cooperatively operate with the transceiver to manage and retrieve an on-hold call from the first communication network after a handout of the wireless communication unit from the first communication network to the second communication network via a call leg established to support the on-hold call to and while the wireless communication unit is operating in the second communication network. However, **Coombes** teaches in an analogous art, that a controller arranged to control and cooperatively operate with the transceiver to manage and retrieve an on-hold call from the first communication network after a handout of the wireless communication unit from the first communication network to the second communication network via a call leg established to support the on-hold call to and while the wireless communication unit is operating in the second communication

Art Unit: 2617

network. (e.g. to retrieve an held call; Col.4; 5-32, Col.6; 12-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify **Jagadeesan** including a controller arranged to control and cooperatively operate with the transceiver to manage and retrieve an on-hold call from the first communication network after a handout of the wireless communication unit from the first communication network to the second communication network via a call leg established to support the on-hold call to and while the wireless communication unit is operating in the second communication network in order to provide a method for holding a call in the first communications service to permit a user to engage that call in a second communications service. (Col.6; 27-40)

As per claim 2, **Jagadeesan** teaches all the particulars of the claim except wherein the controller cooperatively with the transceiver is operable to one of disconnect and place on-hold an active call over the call leg and then connect the on-hold call, where the on-hold call is coupled from the first communication network to the wireless communication unit via the second communication network over the call leg. However, **Coombes** teaches in an analogous art, that the wireless communication unit of claim 1 wherein the controller cooperatively with the transceiver is operable to one of disconnect and place on-hold an active call over the call leg and then connect the on-hold call, where the on-hold call is coupled from the first communication network to the wireless communication unit via the second communication network over the call leg. (e.g. to retrieve an held call; Col.4; 5-32, Col.6; 12-26)

As per claim 11, Jagadeesan teaches:

A communication network switch (300; Fig.3, Col.4; 61-63) operable to route calls for a first communication network, the communication network switch (Abstract) comprising:

A switching function operable to couple the first communication network to a second communication network, where the first communication network and the second communication network comprise a loosely coupled communication network; (Col.4; 19-50) and

Jagadeesan fails to teach, a controller arranged to control and cooperatively operate with the transceiver to manage and retrieve an on-hold call from the first communication network after a handout of the wireless communication unit from the first communication network to the second communication network via a call leg established to support the on-hold call to and while the wireless communication unit is operating in the second communication network. However, **Coombes** teaches in an analogous art, that a controller arranged to control and cooperatively operate with the transceiver to manage and retrieve an on-hold call from the first communication network after a handout of the wireless communication unit from the first communication network to the second communication network via a call leg established to support the on-hold call to and while the wireless communication unit is operating in the second communication network. (e.g. to retrieve an held call; Col.4; 5-32, Col.6; 12-26).

As per claim 12, **Jagadeesan** teaches all the particulars of the claim except wherein the controller cooperatively with the transceiver is operable to one of disconnect and place on-hold an active call over the call leg and then connect the on-hold call, where the on-hold call is coupled from the first communication network to the wireless communication unit via the second communication network over the call leg. However, **Coombes** teaches in an analogous art, that

Art Unit: 2617

the wireless communication unit of claim 11 wherein the controller cooperatively with the transceiver is operable to one of disconnect and place on-hold an active call over the call leg and then connect the on-hold call, where the on-hold call is coupled from the first communication network to the wireless communication unit via the second communication network over the call leg. (e.g. to retrieve an held call; Col.4; 5-32, Col.6; 12-26).

***Response to Amendments & Arguments***

IV. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2, 11-12 has been fully considered but is moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

V. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharad Rampuria whose telephone number is (571) 272-7870.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F. (8:30-5 EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on (571) 272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or [EBC@uspto.gov](mailto:EBC@uspto.gov).



Sharad Rampuria  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2617